

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action mailed December 9, 2009 the Office noted that claims 14-26 were pending and rejected claims 14-26. In this amendment claims 14-26 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 14-26 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office states that the "simplified signature module" uses the wrong reference mark. The Applicants have amended the Specification in conformity with the comments of the Office.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 14 and 26 stand objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that the claims contain antecedent basis issues or use inconsistent phrases. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objection of the Office.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gray, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0188738 in view of Oku, U.S. Patent No. 7,320,024 in further view of Howard, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0204610. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Gray discusses providing a user with access to the Internet (see ¶ 0029 where it states in part "there is shown an arrangement for connecting a data terminal in the form of a computer 10 operated by an end user to the public Internet 12").

The system of Gray operates before the user gets access to the Internet (see ¶ 0036 wherein it states in part "Where an Internet service provider requires an end user to have a user identifier and a password, these details are checked by the authentication and accounting server 24, during an authentication phase, before giving an end user access to the Internet 12").

In Gray, when the user wishes to get access to the Internet, it transmits its identification (the "details") to a NAS (Network Access Server), which transmits them to an authenticating server (see ¶ 0040 wherein it states in part "When the NAS 16 has received these details, it transmits an access-request message containing these details received from the end user to the authentication and accounting server 24").

Thus, it appears that the user does not receive a

request for authentication since the authentication is performed from the user's initiative.

Also, the authentication is not performed in the context of accessing a service through the network, since the user has not yet access the network (in the claims of the present application, it is clearly recited that the request for authentication is transmitted by the service provider when the user contacts it through the network).

Thus, Gray fails to disclose "- a plurality of service providers which are connected to the network, each service provider being capable of transmitting, **through the network**, an authentication request to the user who contacts **the service provider, through the network**, in order to identify and/or authenticate **the** user before providing him with **personalized** and/or secure services, the response to be provided by same user to **the** authentication request being able to be different in accordance with the service provider contacted," (Emphasis indicates amendment) as in claim 14. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 1, 3 and 4 and ¶¶ 0041-0049 of the printed publication version of the Specification.

In the Office Action, the claimed proxy server is analogized with the home gateway disclosed by Gray, this is questionable since Gray discloses an embodiment (Figure 10, item 211), wherein there are disclosed both the home gateway and a proxy server. Hence, logically, only the proxy server disclosed

by Gray may be analogized to the claimed proxy server. Since the proxy server according to Gray does connect the end user to the network, Gray fails to disclose the claimed proxy server.

Thus, Gray fails to disclose "a proxy server through which all the data flows pass which are exchanged between a user and the network," as in claim 14.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the claimed service providers are analogized with the NAS disclosed by Gray, this is questionable since the present application claims that the service providers communicate with the user through the network, which is not the case in Gray' system.

And as conceded in the Official Action, Gray fails to disclose the claimed response different according to the service provider contacted.

Oku and Howard each fail to teach the features discussed above. Further combination of the references fails to teach the features as argued above.

For example, Oku discloses a system for receiving simultaneously contents from a plurality of data. Oku does not relate to receiving authentication requests from service providers or transmitting these requests to a supplemental server according to the invention (see claim 1).

Howard, discusses a method for authenticating a user that wishes to connect to web servers. In the method according to Howard (see Figure 4), there is no request for authentication

sent by the web server and automatically transmitted to a supplemental server as claimed in the present application, since the Web server according to Howard redirects the user to an authentication server. Then, the user has to perform the authentication whereas the present application claims that the response to the authentication request is performed by the simplified signature module. Also, it should be noted that the invention notably aims at avoiding that the users has to authenticate itself (that is why the simplified signature module is provided for handling the request on behalf of the user).

For at least the reasons discussed above, Gray Oku and Howard, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 14 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 14-26 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional
fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jaa

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- ☒ - a new or amended Abstract of the Disclosure
- ☐ - a Replacement Sheet for Figure of the drawings
- ☐ - a Substitute Specification and a marked-up copy of the originally-filed specification
- ☐ - a terminal disclaimer
- ☐ - a 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration
- ☐ - a verified English translation of foreign priority document